arXiv:1411.0857v2 [math.AP] 23 Jun 2015

Well-posedness of non-autonomous linear evolution equations for generators whose commutators are scalar

Jochen Schmid

Fachbereich Mathematik, Universität Stuttgart, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany

jochen.schmid@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de

We prove the well-posedness of non-autonomous linear evolution equations for generators $A(t) : D(A(t)) \subset X \to X$ whose pairwise commutators are complex scalars and, in addition, we establish an explicit representation formula for the evolution. We also prove well-posedness in the more general case where instead of the 1-fold commutators only the p-fold commutators of the operators $A(t)$ are complex scalars. All these results are furnished with rather mild stability and regularity assumptions: indeed, stability in X and strong continuity conditions are sufficient. Additionally, we improve a well-posedness result of Kato for group generators $A(t)$ by showing that the original norm continuity condition can be relaxed to strong continuity. Applications include Segal field operators and Schrödinger operators for particles in external electric fields.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 47D06 (primary), 35Q41 (secondary)
Key words and phrases: well-posedness of non-autonomous linear evolution equations for semigroup generators whose pairwise commutators are complex scalars and for group generators

1 Introduction

In this paper, we are concerned with non-autonomous linear evolution equations

$$x' = A(t)x \ (t \in [s,1]) \quad \text{and} \quad x(s) = y \tag{1.1}$$

for densely defined linear operators $A(t) : D(A(t)) \subset X \to X$ $(t \in [0,1])$ and initial values $y \in Y \subset D(A(s))$ at initial times $s \in [0,1)$. Well-posedness of such evolution equations has been studied by many authors in a large variety of situations. See, for instance, [31], [35], [24], [26] for an overview. In this paper, we are primarily interested in the special situation of semigroup generators $A(t)$ whose first (1-fold) or higher (p-fold)

commutators at distinct times are complex scalars, in short:

$$[A(t_1), A(t_2)] = \mu(t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{C} \tag{1.2}$$

or

$$\big[\dots\big[[A(t_1), A(t_2)], A(t_3)\big]\dots, A(t_{p+1})\big] = \mu(t_1, \dots, t_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{C} \tag{1.3}$$

in some sense to be made precise (see the commutation relations (2.1), (2.11) and (2.14), (2.18)). In this special situation we prove well-posedness for (1.1) on suitable dense subspaces Y of X and, moreover, in the case (1.2) we prove the representation formula

$$U(t,s) = e^{\overline{\int_s^t A(\tau)\, d\tau}}\, e^{1/2 \int_s^t \int_s^\tau \mu(\tau,\sigma)\, d\sigma d\tau} \tag{1.4}$$

for the evolution generated by the operators $A(t)$. We thereby generalize a well-posedness result of Goldstein and of Nickel and Schnaubelt from [12], [29] dealing with the special case of (1.2) where $\mu \equiv 0$: in [12] contraction semigroup generators are considered, while in [29] contraction semigroup generators are replaced by general semigroup generators and the formula (1.4) with $\mu \equiv 0$ is proved.

What one gains by restricting oneself to the special class of semigroup generators with (1.2) or (1.3) – instead of considering general semigroup generators as in [15], [16], [17], for instance – is that well-posedness can be established under fairly weak stability and regularity conditions: 1. It is sufficient – just as in the case of commuting operators from [12], [29] – to require stability of the family A only in X. In contrast to the well-posedness theorems from [16] or [17], for instance, it is not necessary to additionally require stability in a suitable invariant and suitably normed dense subspace Y of X contained in all the domains of the operators $A(t)$, which is generally difficult to verify unless the domains of the $A(t)$ are time-independent. 2. It is sufficient – similarly to the case of commuting operators from [12], [29] or to the elementary case of bounded operators – to require strong continuity conditions: indeed, it is sufficient if

$$t \mapsto A(t)y \quad \text{and} \quad (t_1, \dots, t_{k+1}) \mapsto \big[\dots, [[A(t_1), A(t_2)], A(t_3)]\dots, A(t_{k+1})\big]y$$

are continuous for $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and y in a dense subspace Y of X contained in all the respective domains. In contrast to the well-posedness theorems from [16] or [17], this subspace Y need not be normed in any way whatsoever and $t \mapsto A(t)|_Y$ need not be norm continuous. And furthermore, it is not necessary to require an additional $W^{1,1}$-regularity condition on certain auxiliary operators $S(t) : Y \to X$ (as in the well-posedness theorems from [16], [17] for general semigroup generators $A(t)$) or an additional regularity condition on certain auxiliary norms $\|\,.\,\|_t^{\pm}$ on Y (as in the special well-posedness result from [16] for a certain kind of group generators). Such additional regularity conditions are necessary for well-posedness in general situations without commutator conditions of the kind (1.2) or (1.3) – even if the domains of the $A(t)$ are time-independent (see the examples in [32], [10] or [34], for instance).

As is well-known from [22], [11], [40], in the case of bounded operators $A(t)$ one has representation formulas of Campbell–Baker–Hausdorff and Zassenhaus type for the evolution, which in the case (1.2) reduce to our representation formula (1.4). It should

be noticed, however, that for bounded operators condition (1.2) can be satisfied only if $\mu \equiv 0$, so that (1.4) is independent of [22], [11], [40] (for non-zero μ). In view of the representation formulas from [40] it is desirable to prove representation formulas analogous to (1.4) also in the case (1.3), but this is left to future research.

All proofs in connection with the special situations (1.2) or (1.3) are, in essence, based upon the observation that in these situations the operators $A(r)$ can be commuted – up to controllable errors – through the exponential factors of the standard approximants $U_n(t,s)$ from [12], [16], [17], [29] for the sought evolution, which are of the form

$$U_n(t,s) = e^{A(r_m)\tau_m} \cdots e^{A(r_1)\tau_1}$$

with partition points $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ of the interval $[s,t]$. See (2.5) and (2.16) respectively.

Apart from proving well-posedness for semigroup generators with (1.2) or (1.3) (which is our primary interest), we also improve the above-mentioned special well-posedness result from [16] for a certain kind of group generators: in the spirit of [21] we show that strong (instead of norm) continuity is sufficient in this result – just like in our other well-posedness results for the case (1.2) or (1.3). And in a certain special case involving quasicontraction group generators with time-independent domains in a uniformly convex space, these other results can also be obtained by applying the improved well-posedness result for group generators.

In Section 2 we state and prove our abstract well-posedness results, Section 2.1 and Section 2.2 being devoted to the case (1.2) and (1.3) respectively and Section 2.3 being devoted to the improved well-posedness result for group generators. Section 2.4 discusses, among other things, the relation of our well-posedness results from Section 2.1 and 2.2 to the results from [16], [17], [21] and to the result from Section 2.3. In Section 3 we give some applications, namely to Segal field operators $\Phi(f_t)$ as well as to the related operators $H_\omega + \Phi(f_t)$ describing a classical particle coupled to a time-dependent quantized field of bosons (Section 3.1) and finally to Schrödinger operators describing a quantum particle coupled to a time-dependent spatially constant electric field (Section 3.2).

2 Abstract well-posedness results

We will use the notion of well-posedness and evolution systems from [10]. So, if $A(t) : D(A(t)) \subset X \to X$ for every $t \in I := [0,1]$ is a linear operator and Y is a dense subspace of X contained in $\cap_{\tau \in I} D(A(\tau))$, then the initial value problems (1.1) for A are called *well-posed on* Y if and only if there exists an *evolution system* U *solving* (1.1) *on* Y or, for short, an *evolution system* U *for* A *on* Y. An evolution system for A on Y is, by definition, a family of bounded operators $U(t,s)$ in X for $s \leq t$ such that

(i) $[s,1] \ni t \mapsto U(t,s)y$ for $y \in Y$ and $s \in [0,1)$ is a continuously differentiable solution of (1.1) with values in Y,

(ii) $U(t,s)U(s,r) = U(t,r)$ for all $r \leq s \leq t$ and $(s,t) \mapsto U(t,s)$ is strongly continuous.

Such an evolution system is necessarily unique: if U and V are two evolution systems for A on Y, then $[s,t] \ni \tau \mapsto U(t,\tau)V(\tau,s)y$ for every $y \in Y$ is continuous and right differentiable with vanishing right derivative, because

$$\frac{1}{h}\big(U(t,\tau+h)-U(t,\tau)\big)z = -U(t,\tau+h)\frac{U(\tau+h,\tau)z-z}{h} \longrightarrow -U(t,\tau)A(\tau)z$$

as $h \searrow 0$ for all $z \in Y$ and because $\frac{1}{h}(V(\tau+h,s)y - V(\tau,s)y) \longrightarrow A(\tau)V(\tau,s)y$ as $h \to 0$ and $V(\tau,s)y \in Y$ for all $y \in Y$. With the help of Corollary 2.1.2 of [31] it then follows that

$$V(t,s)y - U(t,s)y = U(t,\tau)V(\tau,s)y\big|_{\tau=s}^{\tau=t} = 0,$$

which by the density of Y in X implies $U = V$, as desired. At some places we will also use the notion of evolution systems from [29], which is slightly weaker than the one above in that it does not require that $[s,1] \ni t \mapsto U(t,s)y$ have values in Y for every $y \in Y$ and $s \in [0,1)$ (while all other conditions from above are taken over). We will then speak of *evolution systems in the wide sense for A on Y* and, in case there exists exactly one such evolution system in the wide sense, we will speak of *well-posedness in the wide sense on Y*. Commutators of possibly unbounded operators are taken in the operator-theoretic sense,

$$D([A,B]) := D(AB-BA) = D(AB) \cap D(BA),$$

except in some formal heuristic computations (whose formal character will always be pointed out). $X = (X, \|\,.\,\|)$ will always stand for a complex Banach space, $I = [0,1]$ denotes the compact unit interval, and Δ the triangle $\{(s,t) \in I^2 : s \le t\}$. We will finally also need the standard notions of (M,ω)-stability, of the part of an operator A in a subspace Y, and of A-admissible subspaces from [16] or [31], and we briefly recall them here for the sake of convenience. A family A of semigroup generators $A(t)$ on X for $t \in I$ is called (M,ω)-*stable* (where $M \in [1,\infty)$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$) if and only if

$$\Big\| e^{A(t_n)s_n} \cdots e^{A(t_1)s_1} \Big\| \le M e^{\omega(s_1+\cdots+s_n)}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t_1,\dots,t_n \in I$ with $t_n \ge \cdots \ge t_1$ and $s_1,\dots,s_n \in [0,\infty)$. If A is an arbitrary operator in X and Y is an arbitrary subspace of X, then the operator $\tilde{A}$ defined by

$$D(\tilde{A}) := \big\{ y \in D(A) \cap Y : Ay \in Y \big\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{A}y := Ay \quad (y \in D(\tilde{A}))$$

is called the *part of A in Y* or, for short, the *Y-part of A*. If A is a semigroup generator on X, then a subspace Y of $X = (X, \|\,.\,\|)$ endowed with a norm $\|\,.\,\|_*$ is called A-*admissible* if and only if

(i) $(Y, \|\,.\,\|_*)$ is a Banach space densely and continuously embedded in $(X, \|\,.\,\|)$,

(ii) $e^{As}\,Y \subset Y$ for all $s \in [0,\infty)$ and the restriction $e^{A\cdot}|_Y$ is a strongly continuous semigroup in $(Y, \|\,.\,\|_*)$.

In this case, the semigroup $e^{A\cdot}|_Y$ is generated by the part $\tilde{A}$ of A in Y.

2.1 Scalar 1-fold commutators

In this subsection we prove well-posedness for (1.1) in the case (1.2) where the 1-fold commutators of the operators $A(t)$ are complex scalars. We have to make precise the merely formal commutation relation (1.2), of course, and we begin with a well-posedness result where (1.2) is replaced by the formally equivalent commutation relation (2.1) for the semigroups $e^{A(t)\cdot}$ with the generators $A(s)$. In addition to well-posedness this theorem also yields a representation formula for the evolution. It is a generalization of a well-posedness result of Goldstein [12] (Theorem 1.1) and – after the slight modifications discussed in (2.33) and (2.34) below – of Nickel and Schnaubelt [29] (Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.5).

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose $A(t) : D(A(t)) \subset X \to X$ for every $t \in I$ is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup on X such that A is (M,ω)-stable for some $M \in [1,\infty)$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and such that for some complex numbers $\mu(s,t) \in \mathbb{C}$*

$$A(s)e^{A(t)\tau} \supset e^{A(t)\tau}\big(A(s) + \mu(s,t)\tau\big) \tag{2.1}$$

for all $s,t \in I$ and $\tau \in [0,\infty)$. Suppose further that the maximal continuity subspace

$$Y^\circ := \{y \in \cap_{\tau\in I} D(A(\tau)) : t \mapsto A(t)y \text{ is continuous}\} \tag{2.2}$$

is dense in X and that $(s,t) \mapsto \mu(s,t)$ is continuous. Then there exists a unique evolution system U for A on Y° and it is given by

$$U(t,s) = e^{\overline{(\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ}} e^{1/2\int_s^t \int_s^\tau \mu(\tau,\sigma)\,d\sigma\,d\tau} \quad ((s,t) \in \Delta),$$

where $\big(\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau\big)^\circ$ is the (closable) operator defined by $y \mapsto \int_s^t A(\tau)y\,d\tau$ on Y°.

Proof. (i) We first show, in three steps, the existence of an evolution system U for A on Y°, which is then necessarily unique by the remark at the beginning of Section 2. In order to do so we approximate the sought evolution U by the standard approximants U_n from hyperbolic evolution equations theory, that is, we choose partitions

$$\pi_n = \{r_{n\,i} : i \in \{0,\dots,m_n\}\}$$

of I with $\operatorname{mesh}(\pi_n) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \to \infty$ and, for any such partition, we evolve piecewise according to the values of $t \mapsto A(t)$ at the finitely many partition points of π_n. So,

$$U_n(t,s) := e^{A(r_n(t))(t-s)} \tag{2.3}$$

for $(s,t) \in \Delta$ with s, t lying in the same partition subinterval of π_n and

$$U_n(t,s) := e^{A(r_n(t))(t-r_n(t))} e^{A(r_n^-(t))(r_n(t)-r_n^-(t))} \cdots e^{A(r_n(s))(r_n^+(s)-s)} \tag{2.4}$$

for $(s,t) \in \Delta$ with s, t lying in different partition subintervals of π_n. In the equations above, $r_n(u)$ for $u \in I$ denotes the largest partition point of π_n less than or equal to u and $r_n^-(u)$, $r_n^+(u)$ is the neighboring partition point below or above $r_n(u)$, respectively.

We then obtain, by repeatedly applying the assumed commutation relation (2.1), the following important commutation relation which allows us to take $A(r)$ from the left of $U_n(t,s)$ to the right and which is central to the entire proof:

$$A(r)U_n(t,s)y = U_n(t,s)\Big(A(r) + \int_s^t \mu(r, r_n(\sigma))\, d\sigma\Big)y \tag{2.5}$$

for all $y \in D(A(r))$. As a first step, we observe that

$$U_n(t,s)U_n(s,r) = U_n(t,r) \quad \text{and} \quad \|U_n(t,s)\| \le Me^{\omega(t-s)} \tag{2.6}$$

for all $(s,t),(r,s) \in \Delta$ and that $\Delta \ni (s,t) \mapsto U_n(t,s)$ is strongly continuous.

As a second step, we show that $(U_n(t,s)x)$ for every $x \in X$ is a Cauchy sequence in X uniformly in $(s,t) \in \Delta$. Since $\cap_{r' \in I} D(A(r'))$ is invariant under the semigroups $e^{A(r)\cdot}$ for all $r \in I$ by (2.1), it follows that $[s,t] \ni \tau \mapsto U_m(t,\tau)U_n(\tau,s)y$ for every $y \in \cap_{r' \in I} D(A(r'))$ is piecewise continuously differentiable (with the partition points of $\pi_m \cup \pi_n$ as exceptional points) and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} U_n(t,s)y - U_m(t,s)y &= U_m(t,\tau)U_n(\tau,s)y\Big|_{\tau=s}^{\tau=t} \\ &= \int_s^t U_m(t,\tau)\big(A(r_n(\tau)) - A(r_m(\tau))\big)U_n(\tau,s)y\, d\tau = \int_s^t U_m(t,\tau)U_n(\tau,s) \\ &\qquad \Big(A(r_n(\tau)) - A(r_m(\tau)) + \int_s^\tau \mu(r_n(\tau), r_n(\sigma)) - \mu(r_m(\tau), r_n(\sigma))\, d\sigma\Big)y\, d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for every $y \in \cap_{r' \in I} D(A(r'))$ where, for the last equation, (2.5) has been used. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(s,t)\in\Delta} \|U_n(t,s)y - U_m(t,s)y\| \le M^2 e^{w(b-a)} \Big(&\int_a^b \|A(r_n(\tau))y - A(r_m(\tau))y\|\, d\tau \\ + \int_a^b \int_a^b \big|\mu(r_n(\tau), r_n(\sigma)) - \mu(r_m(\tau), r_n(\sigma))\big|\, \|y\|\, d\sigma\, d\tau \Big) &\longrightarrow 0 \quad (m,n \to \infty) \end{aligned}$$

for every $y \in Y^\circ$ by the uniform continuity of $\tau \mapsto A(\tau)y$ and $(\tau,\sigma) \mapsto \mu(\tau,\sigma)$. And by (2.6) this uniform Cauchy property extends to all $y \in X$. Consequently,

$$U(t,s)x := \lim_{n\to\infty} U_n(t,s)x$$

for every $x \in X$ exists uniformly in $(s,t) \in \Delta$ and hence the properties observed in the first step carry over from U_n to U.

As a third step, we show that $t \mapsto U(t,s)y$ for every $y \in Y^\circ$ is a continuously differentiable solution to (1.1) with values in Y°. Since $\tau \mapsto U_n(\tau,s)y$ for $y \in \cap_{r' \in I} D(A(r'))$ is piecewise continuously differentiable with piecewise derivative

$$[s,t] \setminus \pi_n \ni \tau \mapsto A(r_n(\tau))U_n(\tau,s)y = U_n(\tau,s)\Big(A(r_n(\tau)) + \int_s^\tau \mu(r_n(\tau), r_n(\sigma))\, d\sigma\Big)y$$

by virtue of (2.5), we have

$$U_n(t,s)y = y + \int_s^t U_n(\tau,s)\Big(A(r_n(\tau)) + \int_s^\tau \mu(r_n(\tau),r_n(\sigma))\,d\sigma\Big)y\,d\tau$$

and therefore

$$U(t,s)y = y + \int_s^t U(\tau,s)\Big(A(\tau) + \int_s^\tau \mu(\tau,\sigma)\,d\sigma\Big)y\,d\tau$$

for all $y \in Y^\circ$. So, $t \mapsto U(t,s)y$ is continuously differentiable for every $y \in Y^\circ$ with derivative

$$t \mapsto U(t,s)\Big(A(t) + \int_s^t \mu(t,\sigma)\,d\sigma\Big)y = \lim_{n\to\infty} A(t)U_n(t,s)y = A(t)U(t,s)y,$$

where the last two equations hold by (2.5) and the closedness of $A(t)$. Also, since for all $y \in Y^\circ$ and $r \in I$

$$A(r)U_n(t,s)y \longrightarrow U(t,s)\Big(A(r) + \int_s^t \mu(r,\sigma)\,d\sigma\Big)y \quad (n\to\infty),$$

we see by the closedness of the operators $A(r)$ that $U(t,s)y \in Y^\circ$ for $y \in Y^\circ$. So, in summary, we have shown that U is an evolution system for A on Y°.

(ii) We now show, in three steps, that $\big(\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau\big)^\circ$ for every fixed $(s,t) \in \Delta$ is closable and that its closure generates a strongly continuous semigroup in X with

$$e^{\overline{(\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ}} = U(t,s)e^{-1/2\int_s^t\int_s^\tau \mu(\tau,\sigma)\,d\sigma\,d\tau}.$$

As a first step, we show a discrete version of the above representation formula: more precisely, we show that $B_n := \int_s^t A(r_n(\tau))\,d\tau$ is closable and that B_n generates a strongly continuous semigroup with the following decomposition of Zassenhaus type:

$$e^{\overline{B_n}r} = U_n^r(t,s)e^{-1/2(\int_s^t\int_s^\tau \mu(r_n(\tau),r_n(\sigma))\,d\sigma\,d\tau)r^2} \quad (r \in [0,\infty)), \tag{2.7}$$

where the operators $U_n^r(t,s)$ are defined in the same way as the operators $U_n(t,s)$ above with the only difference that now the generators $A(u)$ are all multiplied by the number r. Indeed, by the assumed commutation relations, we obtain the following commutation relations for semigroups,

$$e^{A_i\sigma}e^{A_j\tau} = e^{A_j\tau}e^{A_i\sigma}e^{\mu_{ij}\sigma\tau} \quad (\sigma,\tau \in [0,\infty)), \tag{2.8}$$

where $A_k := A(t_k)h_k$ and $\mu_{kl} := \mu(t_k,t_l)h_kh_l$ for arbitrary $t_k, t_l \in I$ and $h_k, h_l \in [0,\infty)$. (In fact, if $y \in D(A_i)$, then

$$e^{A_j\tau}e^{A_i\sigma}e^{\mu_{ij}\sigma\tau}y - e^{A_i\sigma}e^{A_j\tau}y = e^{A_i(\sigma-r)}e^{A_j\tau}e^{A_ir}e^{\mu_{ij}r\tau}y\Big|_{r=0}^{r=\sigma}$$

and $[0,\sigma] \ni r \mapsto e^{A_i(\sigma-r)}e^{A_j\tau}e^{A_i r}e^{\mu_{ij}r\tau}y$ is differentiable with derivative 0.) With the help of (2.8) one verifies that

$$[0,\infty) \ni r \mapsto e^{A_m r}\cdots e^{A_1 r}e^{-1/2\sum_{i\le j}\mu_{ji}r^2} \tag{2.9}$$

is a strongly continuous semigroup in X. As this semigroup, by the assumed commutation relation, leaves the subspace $D(A_1)\cap\cdots\cap D(A_m)$ invariant, its generator contains the operator $A_1+\cdots+A_m$, which is therefore closable with closure equal to the generator. Since B_n is of the form $A_1+\cdots+A_m$ and since the right-hand side of (2.7) is of the form (2.9) (because $\mu_{ii}=0$ by virtue of (2.8)), the assertion of the first step follows.

As a second step, we observe that the limit $T(r)x := \lim_{n\to\infty} e^{\overline{B_n}r}x$ exists locally uniformly in $r\in[0,\infty)$ for every $x\in X$ and that T is a strongly continuous semigroup in X. Indeed, with the same arguments as in (i), it follows that $(U_n^r(t,s)x)$ is convergent locally uniformly in r for every $x\in X$ with limit denoted by $U^r(t,s)x$ and therefore the strongly continuous semigroups $e^{\overline{B_n}\cdot}$ by (2.7) are strongly convergent locally uniformly in r, so that

$$T(r)x := \lim_{n\to\infty} e^{\overline{B_n}r}x = U^r(t,s)e^{-1/2(\int_s^t\int_s^\tau \mu(\tau,\sigma)\,d\sigma\,d\tau)r^2}x \quad (x\in X) \tag{2.10}$$

defines a strongly continuous semigroup T on X.

As a third step, we show that the generator A_T of this semigroup is given by $\overline{B^\circ}$ where $B^\circ := \big(\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau\big)^\circ$, from which the desired representation formula for U then follows by (2.10) (because $U^1(t,s)=U(t,s)$). Indeed, for all $y\in Y^\circ$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{T(h)y-y}{h} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{e^{\overline{B_n}h}y-y}{h} &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{h}\int_0^h e^{\overline{B_n}r}\,\overline{B_n}y\,dr = \frac{1}{h}\int_0^h T(r)B^\circ y\,dr\\ &\longrightarrow B^\circ y \quad (h\searrow 0)\end{aligned}$$

by the dominated convergence theorem. So, B° is closable with $\overline{B^\circ}\subset A_T$. We now want to show that $D(\overline{B^\circ})$ is a core for A_T by verifying the invariance $T(r)D(\overline{B^\circ})\subset D(\overline{B^\circ})$ for all $r\in[0,\infty)$. If $y\in Y^\circ$, then

$$B_m e^{\overline{B_n}r}y = e^{\overline{B_n}r}\big(B_m+\nu_{m,n}r\big)y \quad\text{with}\quad \nu_{m,n} := \int_s^t\int_s^t \mu(r_m(\tau),r_n(\sigma))\,d\sigma\,d\tau$$

by the product decomposition of $e^{\overline{B_n}r}$ from (2.7) and by the central commutation relation (2.5). So,

$$B^\circ e^{\overline{B_n}r}y = e^{\overline{B_n}r}\big(B^\circ+\lim_{m\to\infty}\nu_{m,n}r\big)y$$

for all $y\in Y^\circ$, from which it further follows that

$$T(r)y\in D(\overline{B^\circ}) \quad\text{and}\quad \overline{B^\circ}\,T(r)y = T(r)\big(B^\circ+\lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{m\to\infty}\nu_{m,n}r\big)y = T(r)B^\circ y$$

for all $y\in Y^\circ$. In the last equation, we used that $\mu(\tau,\sigma)=-\mu(\sigma,\tau)$ for all $\sigma,\tau\in I$ which can be seen from (2.8). It follows that $\overline{B^\circ}T(r)\supset T(r)\overline{B^\circ}$ and, in particular, $T(r)D(\overline{B^\circ})\subset D(\overline{B^\circ})$ for all $r\in[0,\infty)$. So, $D(\overline{B^\circ})$ is a core for A_T and hence $A_T=\overline{B^\circ}$, as desired. ∎

We also note the following variant of the above theorem where the form (2.11) of the imposed commutation relation is closer to (1.2). In return, one has to require relatively strong invariance conditions.

Corollary 2.2. *Suppose $A(t) : D(A(t)) \subset X \to X$ for every $t \in I$ is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup on X such that A is (M,ω)-stable for some $M \in [1,\infty)$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose further that Y is an $A(t)$-admissible subspace of X for every $t \in I$ such that*

$$Y \subset \bigcap_{\tau\in I} D(A(\tau)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad A(t)Y \subset \bigcap_{\tau\in I} D(A(\tau)),$$

$A(t)|_Y$ is a bounded operator from Y to X, and

$$[A(s),A(t)]\big|_{D(\tilde{A}(t))} \subset \mu(s,t) \in \mathbb{C} \tag{2.11}$$

for all $s,t \in I$, where $\tilde{A}(t)$ is the part of $A(t)$ in Y. Suppose finally that $(s,t) \mapsto \mu(s,t)$ and $t \mapsto A(t)y$ are continuous for all $y \in Y$. Then the conclusions of the above theorem hold true.

Proof. We verify the assumptions of the previous theorem and, to that purpose, we establish the commutation relations

$$e^{A_1\sigma}e^{A_2\tau} = e^{A_2\tau}e^{A_1\sigma}e^{\mu_{12}\tau\sigma} \quad (\sigma,\tau \in [0,\infty)), \tag{2.12}$$

where $A_k := A(t_k)$ and $\mu_{kl} := \mu(t_k,t_l)$ for arbitrary $t_1,t_2 \in I$. In order to see (2.12), one shows that

$$A_1 e^{A_2\tau}y = e^{A_2\tau}\big(A_1 + \mu_{12}\tau\big)y \tag{2.13}$$

for $y \in Y$ by differentiating $[0,\tau] \ni r \mapsto e^{A_2(\tau-r)}A_1e^{A_2r}y$ for vectors y in the domain of the part $\tilde{A}_2$ of A_2 in Y which by the A_2-admissibility of Y is the generator of the strongly continuous semigroup $t \mapsto e^{A_2t}|_Y$ in Y (Proposition 2.3 of [16]). (In addition to the A_2-admissibility, the boundedness of $A_1|_Y$ from Y to X and the invariance condition $A_1Y \subset D(A_2)$ come into play here.) Along the same lines as (2.8), the relation (2.12) then follows. And since (2.12) is equivalent to the commutation relations (2.1) and since $Y^\circ \supset Y$ is dense in X, the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied, as desired. ∎

2.2 Scalar p-fold commutators

In this subsection we prove well-posedness for (1.1) in the case (1.3) where the p-fold commutators of the operators $A(t)$ are complex scalars for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$. We have to make precise the merely formal commutation relation (1.3), of course, and we begin with a well-posedness result where (1.3) is replaced by the formally equivalent commutation relations (2.14) for the semigroups $e^{A(t)\cdot}$ with the generators $A(s_1) = C^{(0)}(s_1)$ and certain operators $C^{(k)}(s_1,\dots,s_{k+1})$ which are formally given as the k-fold commutator of the operators $A(s_1),\dots,A(s_{k+1})$.

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose $A(t) : D(A(t)) \subset X \to X$ for every $t \in I$ is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup on X such that A is (M,ω)-stable for some $M \in [1,\infty)$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and such that for some closed operators $C^{(k)}(s_1,\dots,s_{k+1})$, where $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$ and $C^{(0)}(s) := A(s)$, and for some complex numbers $\mu(t_1,\dots,t_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{C}$*

$$C^{(k)}(\underline{s})e^{A(t)\tau} \supset e^{A(t)\tau}\big(C^{(k)}(\underline{s}) + C^{(k+1)}(\underline{s},t)\tau + \cdots + C^{(p-1)}(\underline{s},t,\dots,t)\frac{\tau^{p-1-k}}{(p-1-k)!} + \\ + \mu(\underline{s},t,\dots,t)\frac{\tau^{p-k}}{(p-k)!}\big) \qquad (\underline{s} := (s_1,\dots,s_{k+1})) \tag{2.14}$$

for all $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$ and $s_i, t \in I$ and $\tau \in [0,\infty)$. Suppose further that the maximal continuity subspace

$$Y^\circ := \bigcap_{k=0}^{p-1}\{y \in D_k : (t_1,\dots,t_{k+1}) \mapsto C^{(k)}(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1})y \text{ is continuous}\} \tag{2.15}$$

$$D_k := \cap_{\tau_1,\dots,\tau_{k+1}\in I} D(C^{(k)}(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_{k+1}))$$

is dense in X and that $(t_1,\dots,t_{p+1}) \mapsto \mu(t_1,\dots,t_{p+1})$ is continuous. Then there exists a unique evolution system U for A on Y°.

Proof. We define U_n as in (2.3) and (2.4) and, for $u \in I$, we define $i_{n\,u}$ to be the index $i \in \{0,\dots,m_n\}$ with $u \in [r_{n\,i}, r_{n\,i+1})$. We then obtain, by the assumed commutation relations (2.14), the following important commutation relation which allows us to take the operators $A(r)$ from the left of $U_n(t,s)$ to the right:

$$A(r)U_n(t,s)y = U_n(t,s)\big(A(r) + S_n^{(1)}(t,s,r) + \cdots + S_n^{(p)}(t,s,r)\big)y \tag{2.16}$$

$$S_n^{(l)}(t,s,r) := \int_s^t \int_s^{t_n(\tau_1)} \cdots \int_s^{t_n(\tau_{l-1})} C^{(l)}(r, r_n(\tau_1),\dots,r_n(\tau_l))\big/\alpha_{i_{n\,\tau_1},\dots,i_{n\,\tau_l}}\, d\tau_l \dots d\tau_2\, d\tau_1$$

for all $y \in Y^\circ$ and $r \in I$, $(s,t) \in \Delta$ and $l \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, where $C^{(p)} := \mu$ and $t_n(\tau) := \min\{r_n^+(\tau), t\}$ for $\tau \in I$ and where $\alpha_{j_1,\dots,j_l}$ for an l-tupel $(j_1,\dots,j_l)$ of natural numbers denotes the number of permutations σ leaving the l-tupel invariant, that is,

$$(j_{\sigma(1)},\dots,j_{\sigma(l)}) = (j_1,\dots,j_l).$$

(In verifying (2.16), it is best to write $A(r) = A_r = C_r^{(0)}$ and $U_n(t,s) = e^{A_m h_m}\cdots e^{A_1 h_1}$ with $A_j = A(s_j)$ and to prove by induction over $m \in \mathbb{N}$, with the help of the assumed commutation relations, that

$$A_r e^{A_m h_m}\dots e^{A_1 h_1} y = e^{A_m h_m}\dots e^{A_1 h_1}\big(A_r + S^{(1)} + \cdots + S^{(p)}\big)y$$

$$S^{(l)} := \sum_{1\le j_l \le \cdots \le j_1 \le m} C^{(l)}_{r;j_1,\dots,j_l}/\alpha_{j_1,\dots,j_l}\; h_{j_1}\cdots h_{j_l} \quad \text{with} \quad C^{(l)}_{r;j_1,\dots,j_l} := C^{(l)}(r,s_{j_1},\dots,s_{j_l}).$$

It is easy to see that the sums $S^{(l)}$ are nothing but the integrals $S_n^{(l)}(t,s,r)$ in (2.16) and therefore (2.16) follows.) With the help of the commutation relation (2.16), the

continuity of the maps $(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1}) \mapsto C^{(k)}(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1})y$ for $y \in Y^\circ$, the fact that $\alpha_{i_n\tau_1,\dots,i_n\tau_k} \longrightarrow k!$ as $n \to \infty$ for every $(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_k) \in I^k$ with $\tau_1 > \dots > \tau_k$, and the closedness of the operators $A(r)$, we see in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 that

- $(U_n(t,s)x)$ is a Cauchy sequence in X uniformly in $(s,t) \in \Delta$ for every $x \in X$ with limit denoted by $U(t,s)x$,
- $U(t,s)U(s,r) = U(t,r)$ for every $(r,s),(s,t) \in \Delta$ and $(s,t) \mapsto U(t,s)$ is strongly continuous,
- $[s,1] \ni t \mapsto U(t,s)y$ for every $y \in Y^\circ$ is a continuously differentiable solution to (1.1).

Consequently, U is at least an evolution system for A on Y° in the wide sense, and it remains to show that $[s,1] \ni t \mapsto U(t,s)y$ has values in Y° for every $y \in Y^\circ$. In order to do so one establishes, using the same arguments as for (2.16), the commutation relation

$$C^{(k)}(\underline{r})U_n(t,s)y = U_n(t,s)\big(C^{(k)}(\underline{r}) + S_n^{(k+1)}(t,s,\underline{r}) + \dots + S_n^{(p)}(t,s,\underline{r})\big)y \tag{2.17}$$

for all $y \in Y^\circ$ and $\underline{r} \in I^{k+1}$, $(s,t) \in \Delta$ and $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$, where $S_n^{(k+l)}(t,s,\underline{r})$ is defined as the integral of

$$(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_l) \mapsto C^{(k+l)}(\underline{r}, r_n(\tau_1),\dots,r_n(\tau_l))\big/\alpha_{i_n\tau_1,\dots,i_n\tau_l}$$

over the same domain of integration as in the definition of $S_n^{(l)}(t,s,r)$ in (2.16). Since the operators $C^{(k)}(\underline{r})$ are closed for $\underline{r} \in I^{k+1}$ and $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$ by assumption, it follows from (2.17) that for every $y \in Y^\circ$ and $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$ one has:

$$U(t,s)y \in D(C^{(k)}(\underline{r})) \text{ for every } \underline{r} \in I^{k+1} \text{ and } \underline{r} \mapsto C^{(k)}(\underline{r})U(t,s)y \text{ is continuous}$$

or, in other words, that $U(t,s)y \in Y^\circ$ for every $y \in Y^\circ$, as desired. ■

We also note the following variant of the above theorem where the form (2.18) of the imposed commutation relation is closer to (1.3). In return, one has to require relatively strong invariance conditions.

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose $A(t) : D(A(t)) \subset X \to X$ for every $t \in I$ is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup on X such that A is (M,ω)-stable for some $M \in [1,\infty)$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and recursively define $C^{(0)}(t) := A(t)$ as well as $C^{(k)}(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1}) := [C^{(k-1)}(t_1,\dots,t_k), A(t_{k+1})]$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose further that Y is an $A(t)$-admissible subspace of X for every $t \in I$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$ a natural number such that for all $t_i \in I$*

$$Y \subset \bigcap_{\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p \in I} D(C^{(p-1)}(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad C^{(p-1)}(t_1,\dots,t_p)Y \subset \bigcap_{\tau\in I} D(C^{(0)}(\tau)),$$

$C^{(k)}(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1})|_Y$ is a bounded operator from Y to X for all $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$, and

$$C^{(p)}(t_1,\dots,t_{p+1})\big|_{D(\tilde{A}(t_{p+1}))} \subset \mu(t_1,\dots,t_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{C}, \tag{2.18}$$

where $\tilde{A}(t)$ is the part of $A(t)$ in Y. Suppose finally that $(t_1,\dots,t_{p+1}) \mapsto \mu(t_1,\dots,t_{p+1})$ and $(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1}) \mapsto C^{(k)}(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1})y$ are continuous for all $y \in Y$ and $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$. Then there exists a unique evolution system U in the wide sense for A on Y.

Proof. We recall that, by our convention from the beginning of Section 2, the commutators $C^{(k)}(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1})$ are to be understood in the operator-theoretic sense, and we can therefore conclude that

$$Y \subset \bigcap_{\tau_1,\dots,\tau_{k+1}\in I} D(C^{(k)}(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_{k+1})) \qquad \text{and} \qquad C^{(k)}(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1})Y \subset \bigcap_{\tau\in I} D(C^{(0)}(\tau)),$$

for all $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$ by successively proceeding from $p-1$ to 0. With this in mind, one verifies the commutation relations

$$C^{(k)}(\underline{s})e^{A(t)\tau}y = e^{A(t)\tau}\big(C^{(k)}(\underline{s}) + C^{(k+1)}(\underline{s},t)\tau + \cdots + C^{(p-1)}(\underline{s},t,\dots,t)\frac{\tau^{p-1-k}}{(p-1-k)!} + \\ + \mu(\underline{s},t,\dots,t)\frac{\tau^{p-k}}{(p-k)!}\big)y \qquad (\underline{s} := (s_1,\dots,s_{k+1})) \tag{2.19}$$

for all $y \in Y$ and $k \in \{0,\dots,p-1\}$ by proceeding from $p-1$ to 0 and by using, at each successive step, the same arguments as for (2.13). And from (2.19), in turn, one obtains the existence of an evolution system U in the wide sense for A on Y in exactly the same way as in the proof of Theorem 2.3. (It is not to be expected, however, that U is even an evolution system for A on Y in the strict sense. See the sixth remark in Section 2.4.) In order to obtain uniqueness, one has only to observe that for any evolution system V in the wide sense for A on Y,

$$U_n(t,s)y - V(t,s)y = V(t,\tau)U_n(\tau,s)y\big|_{\tau=s}^{\tau=t} = \int_s^t V(t,\tau)\big(A(r_n(\tau)) - A(\tau)\big)U_n(\tau,s)y\,d\tau$$

converges to 0 for every $y \in Y$ and $(s,t) \in \Delta$ by (2.16). ∎

2.3 Well-posedness for group generators

After having proved well-posedness results for semigroup generators with (1.2) or (1.3), we now improve, inspired by [21], the special well-posedness result from [16] (Theorem 5.2 in conjunction with Remark 5.3) for a certain kind of group (instead of semigroup) generators $A(t)$ and certain uniformly convex subspaces Y of the domains $D(A(t))$: we show that this result is still valid if $t \mapsto A(t)|_Y$ is assumed to be only strongly continuous (instead of norm continuous as in [16]). In [21] the same is done for the general well-posedness theorem from [16] (Theorem 6.1). We point out that although several arguments from [21] can be used here as well, it is by no means obvious that the improvement made in [21] can be carried over to the special well-posedness result of [16]. In particular, the possibility of such an improvement is not mentioned in the literature – at least, not in [21], [41], [42], [18], [19], [38], [39].

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose $A(t) : D(A(t)) \subset X \to X$ for every $t \in I$ is the generator of a strongly continuous group on X such that $A^+ := A(\,.\,)$ and $A^- := -A(1-\,.\,)$ are (M,ω)-stable for some $M \in [1,\infty)$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose further that Y for every $t \in I$ is an $A^\pm(t)$-admissible subspace of X contained in $\cap_{\tau\in I} D(A(\tau))$ and that $A(t)|_Y$ is a bounded operator from Y to X such that*

$$t \mapsto A(t)|_Y$$

is strongly continuous. And finally, suppose there exists for each $t \in I$ a norm $\|\,.\,\|_t^\pm$ on Y equivalent to the original norm of Y such that $Y_t^\pm := (Y, \|\,.\,\|_t^\pm)$ is uniformly convex and

$$\|y\|_t^\pm \le e^{c^\pm|t-s|}\,\|y\|_s^\pm \quad (y \in Y \text{ and } s,t \in I) \tag{2.20}$$

for some constant $c^\pm \in (0,\infty)$ and such that the Y-part $\tilde{A}^\pm(t)$ of $A^\pm(t)$ generates a quasicontraction semigroup in $Y_t^\pm$, more precisely

$$\left\|e^{\tilde{A}^\pm(t)\tau}y\right\|_t^\pm \le e^{\omega_0\tau}\,\|y\|_t^\pm \quad (\tau \in [0,\infty), y \in Y, t \in I) \tag{2.21}$$

for some t-independent growth exponent $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a unique evolution system U for A on Y.

Proof. We adopt from [21] the shorthand notation $U^\pm(t,s,\pi)$ for products of the semigroups $e^{A^\pm(t)\,\cdot}$ associated with finite or infinite partitions π in I. Without further specification, convergence or continuity in X, Y will always mean convergence or continuity in the norm of X, Y.

As a first step we show that for each $y \in Y$ and $s \in [0,1)$ there exists a sequence $(\pi_n^\pm) = (\pi_{y,s,n}^\pm)$ of partitions of I such that $(U^\pm(t,s,\pi_{y,s,n}^\pm)y)$ is a Cauchy sequence in X for $t \in [s,1]$. What we have to show here is that for every sequence $\pi = (t_k)$, strictly monotonically increasing in I, and arbitrary $t_k' \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$, the following assertions are satisfied (Lemma 1 of [21]):

(i) $(U^\pm(t_k', t_0, \pi)x)$ is a Cauchy sequence in X for every $x \in X$ whose limit will be denoted by $U^\pm(t_\infty, t_0, \pi)x$ where $t_\infty := \lim_{k\to\infty} t_k'$,

(ii) $(U^\pm(t_k', t_0, \pi)y)$ is a Cauchy sequence in Y for every $y \in Y$.

With the help of Lemma 2 and 3 of [21], whose proofs carry over without change to the present situation, the existence of sequences $(\pi_{y,s,n}^\pm)$ of partitions with the claimed properties then follows. Assertion (i) is simple and is proven in the same way as in [21], while assertion (ii) has to be proven in a completely different way because the proof of [21] essentially rests on the existence of certain isomorphisms $S(t)$ from Y onto X which are not available here. We show, using ideas from [16] (Section 5), that

$$U^\pm(t_\infty, t_0, \pi)y \in Y \quad \text{and} \quad U^\pm(t_k', t_0, \pi)y \longrightarrow U^\pm(t_\infty, t_0, \pi)y \quad \text{weakly in } Y \tag{2.22}$$

for every $y \in Y$ and that

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \big\|U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_0,\pi)y\big\|^{\mp}_{\overline{t}_\infty} \le \big\|U^{\pm}(t_\infty,t_0,\pi)y\big\|^{\mp}_{\overline{t}_\infty} \quad (\overline{t}_\infty := 1-t_\infty) \tag{2.23}$$

for $y \in Y$, which two things by the uniform convexity of $Y_{\overline{t}_\infty}$ imply the convergence

$$U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_0,\pi)y \longrightarrow U^{\pm}(t_\infty,t_0,\pi)y \text{ in } Y$$

and in particular assertion (ii). In order to see (2.22) notice first that $\tilde{A}^{\pm}$ is $(\tilde{M},\tilde{\omega})$-stable for some $\tilde{M} \in [1,\infty)$ and $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}$ by (2.20) and (2.21) (Proposition 3.4 of [16]), so that the sequence $(U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_0,\pi)y)$ is bounded in the norm of Y (recall that

$$e^{A^{\pm}(t)\tau}\big|_Y = e^{\tilde{A}^{\pm}(t)\tau}$$

by Proposition 2.3 of [16]). Since Y is reflexive (Milman's theorem), every subsequence of $(U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_0,\pi)y)$ has in turn a weakly convergent subsequence in Y whose weak limit must be equal to $U^{\pm}(t_\infty,t_0,\pi)y$ by assertion (i), and therefore (2.22) follows. In order to see (2.23) notice first that $(U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_n,\pi)x)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in X for every $x \in X$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$U^{\pm}(t'_k,\tau,\pi) := U^{\pm}(\tau,t'_k,\pi)^{-1} = e^{-A^{\pm}(t_k)(t_{k+1}-t'_k)} \dots e^{-A^{\pm}(r_\pi(\tau))(\tau-r_\pi(\tau))}$$

for $\tau \in (t'_k,t_\infty)$ and where $r_\pi(\tau)$ denotes the largest point of π less than or equal to τ. Indeed, for every $x \in Y$,

$$U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_m,\pi)x - U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_n,\pi)x = -\int_{t_m}^{t_n} U^{\pm}(t'_k,\tau,\pi)A^{\pm}(r_\pi(\tau))x\,d\tau \longrightarrow 0 \quad (m,n\to\infty)$$

in X and by the (M,ω)-stability of $A^{\mp}$, this convergence extends to all $x \in X$. We denote the limit by $U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_\infty,\pi)x$ and note for later use that

$$U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_\infty,\pi)y \in Y \quad \text{and} \quad U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_n,\pi)y \longrightarrow U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_\infty,\pi)y \quad \text{weakly in } Y \tag{2.24}$$

by the same arguments as those for (2.22). Since $U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_0,\pi) = U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_n,\pi)U^{\pm}(t_n,t_0,\pi)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that

$$U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_0,\pi) = U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_\infty,\pi)U^{\pm}(t_\infty,t_0,\pi). \tag{2.25}$$

Also, since

$$U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_n,\pi) = e^{A^{\mp}(\overline{t}_k)(t_{k+1}-t'_k)} \dots e^{A^{\mp}(\overline{t}_{n-1})(t_n-t_{n-1})} \quad (\overline{t}_i := 1-t_i)$$

for $n \ge k+1$, it follows by successively passing from $\|\,.\,\|^{\mp}_{\overline{t}_\infty}$ to $\|\,.\,\|^{\mp}_{\overline{t}_k}$ to ... to $\|\,.\,\|^{\mp}_{\overline{t}_{n-1}}$ and back to $\|\,.\,\|^{\mp}_{\overline{t}_\infty}$ with the help of (2.20), and by using (2.21) at each successive step, that

$$\big\|U^{\pm}(t'_k,t_n,\pi)z\big\|^{\mp}_{\overline{t}_\infty} \le e^{2c^{\mp}(t_\infty-t_k)}\, e^{\omega_0(t_n-t'_k)}\, \|z\|^{\mp}_{\overline{t}_\infty}$$

for every $z \in Y$, and therefore

$$\big\|U^{\pm}(t'_k, t_\infty, \pi)z\big\|^{\mp}_{t_\infty} \le e^{2c^{\mp}(t_\infty - t_k)}\, e^{\omega_0(t_\infty - t'_k)}\, \|z\|^{\mp}_{t_\infty} \tag{2.26}$$

for $z \in Y$ by virtue of (2.24). Combining now (2.25) and (2.26) we obtain (2.23), which concludes our first step.

As a second step we observe that $U_0^{\pm}(t,s)y := \lim_{n\to\infty} U^{\pm}(t,s,\pi^{\pm}_{y,s,n})y$ for $y \in Y$ and $(s,t) \in \Delta$ defines a linear operator from Y to X extendable to a bounded operator $U^{\pm}(t,s)$ in X, and that $U^{\pm}$ is an evolution system in X such that $t \mapsto U^{\pm}(t,s)y$ for every $y \in Y$ is right differentiable (in the norm of X) at s with right derivative $A^{\pm}(s)y$. All this follows in the same way as in [21] (Lemma 4 and 5). In particular, it follows from the right differentiability and evolution system properties just mentioned that $[0,t] \ni s \mapsto U^{\pm}(t,s)y$ is continuously differentiable (from both sides) for every $y \in Y$ with derivative $s \mapsto -U^{\pm}(t,s)A^{\pm}(s)y$ by Corollary 2.1.2 of [31].

As a third step we show that $U^{\pm}(t,s)$ leaves the subspace Y invariant for every $(s,t) \in \Delta$ and that $[s,1] \ni t \mapsto U^{\pm}(t,s)y$ is right continuous in Y for every $y \in Y$. In order to see that $U^{\pm}(t,s)y$ lies in Y for $y \in Y$, notice that the sequence $(U^{\pm}(t,s,\pi^{\pm}_{y,s,n})y)$ is bounded in the norm of Y, whence by the same argument as for (2.22)

$$U^{\pm}(t,s)y \in Y \quad \text{and} \quad U^{\pm}(t,s,\pi^{\pm}_{y,s,n})y \longrightarrow U^{\pm}(t,s)y \quad \text{weakly in } Y. \tag{2.27}$$

In order to see that $[s,1] \ni t \mapsto U^{\pm}(t,s)y$ is right continuous in Y for every $y \in Y$, we have only to show, by the invariance property just established, that $U^{\pm}(t+h,t)y \longrightarrow y$ in Y as $h \searrow 0$ for every $t \in [0,1)$. And for this in turn it is sufficient to show, by the uniform convexity of Y_t, that

$$U^{\pm}(t+h,t)y \longrightarrow y \quad \text{weakly in } Y \text{ as } h \searrow 0 \tag{2.28}$$

and

$$\limsup_{h\searrow 0} \big\|U^{\pm}(t+h,t)y\big\|^{\pm}_t \le \|y\|^{\pm}_t \tag{2.29}$$

Since this can be achieved in a way similar to the proof of (2.22) and (2.23), we may omit the details.

We can now show that $t \mapsto U^{+}(t,s)y$ is continuous in Y for every $y \in Y$ and then conclude the proof. Indeed, $\tau \mapsto U^{\mp}(1-s,1-\tau)z$ is differentiable for $z \in Y$ with derivative $\tau \mapsto U^{\mp}(1-s,1-\tau)A^{\mp}(1-\tau)z$ by the last remark of our second step and $\tau \mapsto U^{\pm}(\tau,s)y$ is right differentiable for $y \in Y$ with right derivative $\tau \mapsto A^{\pm}(\tau)U^{\pm}(\tau,s)y$ because for every $\tau \in [s,1)$ the vector $z := U^{\pm}(\tau,s)y$ lies in Y and

$$\frac{1}{h}\big(U^{\pm}(\tau+h,s)y - U^{\pm}(\tau,s)y\big) = \frac{1}{h}\big(U^{\pm}(\tau+h,\tau)z - z\big) \longrightarrow A^{\pm}(\tau)z \quad (h \searrow 0)$$

by our second and third step. So, the map $[s,t] \ni \tau \mapsto U^{\mp}(1-s,1-\tau)U^{\pm}(\tau,s)y$ is right differentiable for every $y \in Y$ with right derivative 0. Corollary 2.1.2 of [31] therefore yields

$$U^{\mp}(1-s,1-t)U^{\pm}(t,s)y - y = U^{\mp}(1-s,1-\tau)U^{\pm}(\tau,s)y\big|^{\tau=t}_{\tau=s} = 0$$

for every $y \in Y$ and hence

$$U^{\mp}(1-s,1-t)U^{\pm}(t,s) = 1 = U^{\mp}(1-\overline{t},1-\overline{s})U^{\pm}(\overline{s},\overline{t}) = U^{\mp}(t,s)U^{\pm}(1-s,1-t)$$

for all $(s,t) \in \Delta$. It follows that

$$U^{+}(t-h,s)y = U^{+}(t,t-h)^{-1}U^{+}(t,s)y = U^{-}(1-t+h,1-t)U^{+}(t,s)y \longrightarrow U^{+}(t,s)y$$

in Y as $h \searrow 0$ by our third step, whence $t \mapsto U^{+}(t,s)y$ right *and* left continuous and hence continuous in Y. Combining this with the previous steps, we see with the help of Corollary 2.1.2 of [31] that $t \mapsto U^{+}(t,s)y$ is continuously differentiable in X for every $y \in Y$ with derivative $t \mapsto A^{+}(t)U^{+}(t,s)y$ and therefore $U := U^{+}$ is an evolution system for $A = A^{+}$ on Y, as desired. ■

Incidentally, it is also possible to improve (a version of) the well-posedness theorem from [17] (Theorem 1) in the spirit of [21]: in this theorem strong continuity of $t \mapsto A(t)|_Y$ is sufficient as well, provided that A is (M,ω)-stable (instead of only quasistable) and that $t \mapsto \|B(t)\|$ is bounded (instead of only upper integrable). (We make this proviso in order to make sure that the boundedness condition (2.1) of [21] is still satisfied for arbitrary partitions π and that (2.2) of [21] is satisfied with the modified right hand side $C\,\|x\| \int_{t_i}^{t'_k} \alpha(\tau)\,d\tau$, where α is a suitable integrable function. All other arguments from [21] carry over without formal change, a bit more care being necessary in the justification of assertion (c) of [21] because of the weaker regularity of $t \mapsto S(t)$ – see [9].)

2.4 Some remarks

We close this section about abstract well-posedness results with some remarks concerning, in particular, the relation of the results from Section 2.1 and 2.2 with the results from [16], [17], [21], [29] and the result from Section 2.3.

1. Compared to the well-posedness theorems from [16], [17], [21] where no commutator conditions of the kind (1.2) or (1.3) are imposed, the well-posedness theorems from Section 2.1 and 2.2 are furnished with rather mild stability and regularity conditions: Concerning stability, we had only to require in the theorems from Section 2.1 and 2.2 that the family A be (M,ω)-stable in X (or that the slightly weaker stability condition (2.33) be satisfied). In the well-posedness theorems from [16], [17], [21], by contrast, it has to be required in addition that there exist an $A(t)$-admissible subspace Y of X contained in all the domains of the $A(t)$ such that the induced family $\tilde{A}$ consisting of the Y-parts $\tilde{A}(t)$ of the $A(t)$ is $(\tilde{M},\tilde{\omega})$-stable in Y. Such a subspace Y is generally difficult to find – unless the domains of the $A(t)$ are time-independent. (In this latter case, one can choose $Y := D(A(0)) = D(A(t))$ endowed with the graph norm of $A(0)$, provided only that $t \mapsto A(t)$ is of bounded variation – just apply Proposition 4.4 of [16] with $S(t) := A(t) - (\omega + 1)$.) Concerning regularity, we had only to require strong continuity conditions in the theorems from Section 2.1 and 2.2: namely, we had to require that

$$t \mapsto C^{(0)}(t)y = A(t)y \quad \text{and} \quad (t_1,\ldots,t_{k+1}) \mapsto C^{(k)}(t_1,\ldots,t_{k+1})y$$

be continuous for $k \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and y in a dense subspace Y of X contained in all the respective domains or, equivalently, that the maximal continuity subspaces (2.2) or (2.15) be dense in X and that μ be continuous. In general situations without commutator conditions of the kind (1.2) or (1.3), by contrast, strong continuity conditions are not sufficient for well-posedness – not even if the domains of the $A(t)$ are time-independent. (See the respective counterexamples in [32] (Example 6.4), [10] (Example VI.9.21), [34] (Example 1 and 2).) Accordingly, in the general well-posedness results from [16] (Theorem 6.1), [21], and [17] (Theorem 1) for general semigroup generators $A(t)$, there is a strong $W^{1,1}$-regularity condition on certain auxiliary operators $S(t)$ defined on an $A(t)$-admissible subspace Y of X contained in all the domains $D(A(t))$, which boils down to a strong $W^{1,1}$-regularity condition on $t \mapsto A(t)$ in the case of time-independent domains $D(A(t)) = Y$ (Remark 6.2 of [16]); and in the special well-posedness result (Theorem 5.2 and Remark 5.3) from [16] for group generators $A(t)$, there still is a norm continuity condition on $t \mapsto A(t)|_Y$ and a regularity condition on certain auxiliary norms $\|\,.\,\|_t^{\pm}$ on Y, which boils down to a Lipschitz continuity condition on $t \mapsto A(t)$ in the case of time-independent domains $D(A(t)) = Y$ (Theorem 2.1 of [34]).

2. In a certain special case involving group generators $A(t)$ with time-independent domains, the well-posedness assertion of the theorems from Section 2.1 and 2.2 can alternatively also be inferred from the well-posedness theorem from Section 2.3. In fact, if in addition to the assumptions of Theorem 2.3 the following three conditions are satisfied, then the well-posedness assertion of this theorem (but no representation formula, of course) also follows from Theorem 2.5:

- $A(t)$ for every $t \in I$ is a quasicontraction group generator with time-independent domain $D(A(t)) = Y$ in the uniformly convex space X such that

$$\left\| e^{\pm A(t)\tau} \right\| \leq e^{\omega\tau} \quad (\tau \in [0, \infty)) \tag{2.30}$$

  for some t-independent growth exponent $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$,

- $C^{(k)}(t_1, \ldots, t_{k+1})$ is a bounded operator on X for every $(t_1, \ldots, t_{k+1}) \in I^{k+1}$ and

$$\sup_{(t_1,\ldots,t_{k+1}) \in I^{k+1}} \left\| C^{(k)}(t_1, \ldots, t_{k+1}) \right\| < \infty \tag{2.31}$$

  for every $k \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ (an empty condition for $p = 1$!),

- $t \mapsto A(t)y$ is continuous for every $y \in Y$.

Indeed, under these conditions the norms $\|\,.\,\|_t^{\pm}$ appearing in Theorem 2.5 can be chosen to be $\|\,.\,\|_* := \|(A(0) - \omega - 1)\,.\,\|$ for every $t \in I$ (t-independent!): with this norm, Y becomes a uniformly convex subspace admissible for the group generators $\pm A(t)$ and

$$\left\| e^{\pm A(t)\tau} y \right\|_* \leq e^{\omega_0 \tau} \|y\|_* \quad (y \in Y \text{ and } \tau \in [0, \infty)) \tag{2.32}$$

for a suitable $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and finally $Y^\circ = Y$. (In order to see (2.32) and the $\pm A(t)$-admissibility of Y one checks that (2.14) holds true for $\tau \in (-\infty, 0)$ as well, so that in particular

$$A(0)e^{\pm A(t)\tau}y = e^{\pm A(t)\tau}\big(A(0) + C^{(1)}(0,t)(\pm\tau) + \cdots + C^{(p-1)}(0,t,\dots,t)(\pm\tau)^{p-1}/(p-1)! + \mu(0,t,\dots,t)(\pm\tau)^p/p!\big)y$$

for all $y \in Y$ and $\tau \in [0,\infty)$. With the help of (2.30) and (2.31) the desired $\pm A(t)$-admissibility and the quasicontraction group property (2.32) then readily follow.)

3. In the well-posedness theorems from [14] and [26] weaker notions of well-posedness are used than here [27], which in return allows for weaker regularity assumptions than those of [17] and [21] (but the stability conditions are the same). In the second product representation theorem from [30] (Proposition 4.9) which also asserts well-posedness, there seems to be missing, in the hyperbolic case, an additional stability and regularity assumption of the kind of condition (ii") from [16]. At least, it is not clear [25] how the asserted well-posedness should be established and how the range condition from Chernoff's theorem (invoked in [30]) should be verified without such an additional assumption. (In this respect, see in particular Theorem 4.19 of [28] and the remarks preceding it, which state that $\mathcal{Y}$ is a core for $\mathcal{G}$ only under the additional condition (ii") from [16].) As far as [5] is concerned, it should be remarked that the abstract well-posedness theorem of this paper is actually a corollary of the well-posedness theorem of [17]. (Indeed, if for every $y \in Y$ the map $t \mapsto S(t)y$ is differentiable at all except countably many points with an exceptional set N not depending on y and if $\sup_{t\in I\setminus N}\|S'(t)y\| < \infty$, then $t \mapsto S(t)y$ is already absolutely continuous (Theorem 6.3.11 of [4]) and

$$S(t)y = S(0)y + \int_0^t S'(\tau)y\,d\tau$$

(Proposition 1.2.3 of [1]) for every $y \in Y$, so that the strong $W^{1,1}$-regularity condition for $t \mapsto S(t)$ from [17] is satisfied.)

4. It is clear from the proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 that the well-posedness statements remain valid if the (M,ω)-stability condition of these theorems is replaced by the condition from [29] that there exist a sequence (π_n) of partitions of I such that $\mathrm{mesh}(\pi_n) \longrightarrow 0$ and

$$\left\|e^{A(r_n(t))(t-r_n(t))}\cdots e^{A(r_n(s))(r_n^+(s)-s)}\right\| \le Me^{\omega(t-s)} \quad ((s,t)\in\Delta). \tag{2.33}$$

In [29] this stability condition is shown to be strictly weaker than (M,ω)-stability. Also, it is clear from the proof of Theorem 2.1 that the representation formula for the evolution is still valid if (2.33) is sharpened to

$$\left\|e^{A(r_n(t))r(t-r_n(t))}\cdots e^{A(r_n(s))r(r_n^+(s)-s)}\right\| \le Me^{\omega r(t-s)} \quad ((s,t)\in\Delta, r\in[0,\infty)). \tag{2.34}$$

In particular, the method of proof of Theorem 2.1 yields an alternative and more elementary proof (without reference to the Trotter–Kato theorem) of Proposition 2.5 from [29]

(or, rather, of a slightly corrected version of it: in order for the proof of [29] to work one has to choose as the domain of $\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau$ the maximal continuity subspace Y° of A as defined in (2.2), instead of the quite arbitrary subspace denoted by Y in [29] because such a subspace, in contrast to Y°, is not left invariant by $(\overline{B}_n - \lambda)^{-1}$ in general).

5. In the situation of Theorem 2.1, one might think that it should be possible to (more efficiently) obtain the well-posedness of the initial value problems (1.1) on Y° by first defining a candidate U for the sought evolution system through the representation formula

$$U(t,s) := e^{\overline{(\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ}} e^{1/2 \int_s^t \int_s^\tau \mu(\tau,\sigma)\,d\sigma\,d\tau},$$

and by then verifying that this candidate is indeed an evolution system for A on Y°. In order to prove that the closure of $(\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ$ exists and is a semigroup generator, one might want to employ the theorem of Trotter and Kato as in [29] – instead of exploiting the locally uniform convergence of the sequences $(U_n^r(t,s)x)$ as we did. And in order to verify the evolution system properties for U, one might want to make rigorous the following formal differentiation rule for exponential operators (appearing in [40], for instance):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{e^{B(t+h)} - e^{B(t)}}{h} &= \frac{e^{B(t+h)\tau} e^{B(t)(1-\tau)}}{h}\Big|_{\tau=0}^{\tau=1} = \int_0^1 e^{B(t+h)\tau} \frac{B(t+h) - B(t)}{h}\, e^{B(t)(1-\tau)}\,d\tau \\ &\longrightarrow \int_0^1 e^{B(t+h)\tau} B'(t)\, e^{B(t)(1-\tau)}\,d\tau \quad (h \to 0) \end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

with $B(t) := \overline{(\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ}$. Yet, this is possible only if $\operatorname{Re}\mu(\tau,\sigma) \geq 0$ for all $\sigma \leq \tau$ because only then can the right hand side of (2.7) be dominated by a bound $M' e^{\omega' r}$ for all $r \in [0,\infty)$ uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (a first crucial assumption of the Trotter–Kato theorem). And moreover, the verification of the density of $\operatorname{ran}((\int_s^t A(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ - \lambda)$ in X for $\lambda > \omega'$ (a second crucial assumption of the Trotter–Kato theorem) and the verifications of the evolution system properties for U with the help of (2.35) are more involved than the arguments in our approach.

6. In Proposition 2.4 we obtained well-posedness on the given subspace Y only in the wide sense, that is, the existence of a unique evolution system U for A on Y in the wide sense. We could not prove the invariance of Y under the operators $U(t,s)$, however (while in the special case $p = 1$ we could prove such an invariance for a different subspace, namely (2.2), in Corollary 2.2). And, in fact, we do not expect it to be true in general: at least, it is not possible to obtain this invariance – as in Theorem 2.3 – by a closedness argument from (2.17) (which equation is still true in the situation of Proposition 2.4 for vectors $y \in Y$) because in general, under the assumptions of Proposition 2.4, none of the operators $C^{(k)}(t_1,\ldots,t_{k+1})|_Y$ will be a closed operator in X. Choose, for instance,

$$A(t) := A_0 + B(t) = A_0 + b(t)B_0 \quad \text{in } X := L^1(I),$$

where $A_0 f := \partial_x f$ for $f \in D(A_0) = \{f \in W^{1,1}(I) : f(1) = 0\}$ and $(B_0 f)(x) := x^p f(x)$ for $f \in X$ and where $t \mapsto b(t) \in \mathbb{C}$ is continuous, and then choose

$$Y := D(A_0^2) \text{ if } p = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Y := D(A_0^p) \text{ if } p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$$

endowed with the norm of $W^{2,1}(I)$ or $W^{p,1}(I)$, respectively. It is then easy to see that, indeed, all the assumptions of Proposition 2.4 are satisfied, but $C^{(k)}(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1})|_Y$ is non-closed for every $k \in \{0,\dots,p\}$ and every $(t_1,\dots,t_{k+1}) \in I^{k+1}$. (We point out that in this specific example one nevertheless does have the invariance of Y under the operators $U(t,s)$ for $s \le t$, but this seems to essentially depend on the specific structure of the example: since $A(t)$ is A_0 plus a bounded perturbation $B(t)$, the evolution system U for A on Y in the wide sense satisfies

$$U(t,s)f = e^{A_0(t-s)}f + \int_s^t e^{A_0(t-\tau)}B(\tau)U(\tau,s)f\,d\tau \quad (f \in X)$$

and hence is given by the respective perturbation series expansion; and since $e^{A_0\cdot}|_Y$ is a strongly continuous semigroup in Y and $B(t)|_Y$ is a bounded operator in Y, this perturbation series leaves Y invariant.)

3 Some applications of the abstract results

We now discuss some applications of the abstract results from Section 2. In all of them the operators $A(t)$ will be skew self-adjoint in a Hilbert space X.

3.1 Segal field operators

In this subsection we apply the well-posedness result of Section 2.1 to Segal field operators $\Phi(f_t)$ in $\mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h})$, the symmetric Fock space over a complex Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h}$. Segal field operators $\Phi(f)$ are defined for $f \in \mathfrak{h}$ as the closure of $2^{-1/2}(a(f)+a^*(f))$, where $a(f)$ and $a^*(f)$ are the usual annihilation and creation operators in $\mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h})$ corresponding to f. It is well-known that the operators $\Phi(f)$ are self-adjoint and, as a consequence of the canonical commutation relations for creation and annihilation operators, they satisfy the commutation relations

$$[\Phi(f),\Phi(g)] = i\,\mathrm{Im}\,\langle f,g\rangle \quad (f,g \in \mathfrak{h}) \tag{3.1}$$

on a suitable dense subspace of $\mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h})$. See [2] (Section 5.2.1), [33] (Section X.7) or [8] (Section 5.4) for these and other standard facts about such operators and basic concepts from quantum field theory. In view of (3.1) we expect to obtain well-posedness for the operators $A(t) = i\Phi(f_t)$ by means of Theorem 2.1. Indeed, we have:

Corollary 3.1. *Set $A(t) = i\Phi(f_t)$ in $X := \mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h})$ and suppose that $t \mapsto f_t \in \mathfrak{h}$ is continuous. Then there exists a unique evolution system U for A on the maximal continuity subspace Y° for A and it is given by*

$$U(t,s) = e^{\overline{(\int_s^t i\Phi(f_\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ}}e^{-i/2\int_s^t\int_s^\tau \mathrm{Im}\langle f_\tau,f_\sigma\rangle\,d\sigma\,d\tau} = W\Big(\int_s^t f_\tau\,d\tau\Big)e^{-i/2\int_s^t\int_s^\tau \mathrm{Im}\langle f_\tau,f_\sigma\rangle\,d\sigma\,d\tau}$$

where $W(h) := e^{i\Phi(h)}$ denotes the Weyl operator for $h \in \mathfrak{h}$.

Proof. We have already remarked that the operators $A(t)$ are skew self-adjoint and hence (semi)group generators. We also see, by the Weyl form

$$\Phi(f)e^{i\Phi(g)} = e^{i\Phi(g)}\big(\Phi(f) - \operatorname{Im}\langle f, g\rangle\big) \tag{3.2}$$

of the canonical commutation relations (Proposition 5.2.4 (1) in [2]), that the generators $A(s)$ can be commuted through the groups $e^{A(t)\,\cdot}$ in the way required in (2.1) with $\mu(s,t) = -i\operatorname{Im}\langle f_s, f_t\rangle$. It remains to show that the maximal continuity subspace Y° for A is a dense subspace of X. In order to do so, one uses that for every $f \in \mathfrak{h}$ one has: $D(N^{1/2}) \subset D(\Phi(f))$ and

$$\|\Phi(f)\psi\| = \big\|2^{-1/2}(a(f) + a^*(f))\psi\big\| \leq 2^{1/2}\,\|f\|\,\big\|(N+1)^{1/2}\psi\big\| \tag{3.3}$$

for every $\psi \in D(N^{1/2})$ (Lemma 5.3 of [8]), where N is the number operator in $\mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h})$. Since $t \mapsto f_t$ is continuous by assumption, the estimate (3.3) shows that the maximal continuity subspace Y° for A contains the dense subspace $D(N^{1/2})$ of X and is therefore dense itself. So, the desired well-posedness statement and the first of the asserted representation formulas for U follow from Theorem 2.1. In order to see the second representation formula for U, repeatedly apply the identity

$$W(f)W(g) = W(f+g)e^{-i/2\,\operatorname{Im}\langle f,g\rangle} \tag{3.4}$$

(Proposition 5.2.4 (2) of [2]) to the approximants U_n for U from the proof of Theorem 2.1 and use the strong continuity of $\mathfrak{h} \ni h \mapsto W(h)$ (Proposition 5.2.4 (4) of [2]). Alternatively, the well-posedness statement and the first representation formula could also be concluded from Corollary 2.2 with $Y := D(N)$ endowed with the graph norm of N. Indeed, Y with this norm is an $A(t)$-admissible subspace of X because

$$Ne^{i\Phi(f)} = e^{i\Phi(f)}\big(N + \Phi(if) + \|f\|^2/2\big)$$

for all $f \in \mathfrak{h}$ (Proposition 2.2 of [23]), $Y \subset \cap_{\tau\in I} D(A(\tau))$ and $A(t)Y \subset D(N^{1/2}) \subset \cap_{\tau\in I} D(A(\tau))$ by the definition of creation and annihilation operators, $A(t)|_Y$ is a bounded operator from Y to X by (3.3), and finally $[A(s), A(t)]|_{D(N)} \subset -i\operatorname{Im}\langle f_s, f_t\rangle$ (Proposition 5.2.3 (3) of [2]). ∎

It is possible to give at least two alternative proofs of variants of the above result and we briefly comment on these alternative approaches (which, however, are not necessary for understanding Corollary 3.2 below). A first alternative approach is based upon the fifth remark from Section 2.4, which is applicable here because $\operatorname{Re}\mu(\tau,\sigma) = 0$ for all $\sigma, \tau \in I$. It yields the following version of Corollary 3.1: if $t \mapsto f_t \in \mathfrak{h}$ is continuous, then there exists a unique evolution system U for A on the maximal continuity subspace Y° for A and U is given by the first representation formula of the corollary. A second alternative – and more pedestrian – approach is based upon a well-known exponential series expansion for Weyl operators, namely (3.6) below, and yields the following version of Corollary 3.1 for $\mathfrak{h} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$: if both

$$t \mapsto f_t \in \mathfrak{h} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{and} \quad t \mapsto f_t/\sqrt{\omega} \in \mathfrak{h} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$$

are continuous for a measurable function $\omega : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\omega(k) > 0$ for almost all $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$, then there exists a unique evolution system U in the wide sense for A on $Y = D(H_\omega^{1/2})$ (where H_ω is the second quantization of ω defined in (3.7) and (3.8) below) and U is given by the second representation formula from the corollary above. In order to see this by pedestrian arguments, one defines a candidate for the sought evolution U in the wide sense through

$$U(t,s) := W\Big(\int_s^t f_\tau \, d\tau\Big) \, e^{-i/2 \int_s^t \int_s^\tau \operatorname{Im}\langle f_\tau, f_\sigma\rangle \, d\sigma \, d\tau} \tag{3.5}$$

and exploits the exponential series expansion

$$W(g)\psi = e^{i\Phi(g)}\psi = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{i^n}{n!} \, \Phi(g)^n \psi \qquad (g \in \mathfrak{h}) \tag{3.6}$$

for Weyl operators $W(g)$ on vectors ψ in the finite particle subspace $\mathcal{F}_+^0(\mathfrak{h}) := \{\psi \in \mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h}) : \psi^{(n)} = 0 \text{ for all but finitely many } n\}$. (See the proof of Theorem X.41 of [33].) With this expansion, one can show by term-wise differentiation and repeated application of the commutation relation $[\Phi(f), \Phi(g)]|_{\mathcal{F}_+^0(\mathfrak{h})} \subset i \operatorname{Im}\langle f, g\rangle$ (Theorem X.41 (c) of [33]) that the mapping $t \mapsto U(t,s)\psi$ is differentiable for $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_+^0(\mathfrak{h})$ with the desired derivative $t \mapsto i\Phi(f_t)U(t,s)\psi$. Since $\mathcal{F}_+^0(\mathfrak{h})$ is a core for $\Phi(f_t)|_Y$ uniformly in $t \in I$ by virtue of (3.9) below (recall, $Y = D(H_\omega^{1/2})$) and since the operators $\Phi(f_t)$ can be commuted through $U(t,s)$ up to scalar errors by virtue of (3.2), there exists for every $\psi \in Y$ a sequence (ψ_n) in $\mathcal{F}_+^0(\mathfrak{h})$ such that $\psi_n \longrightarrow \psi$ and

$$i\Phi(f_t)U(t,s)\psi_n \longrightarrow U(t,s)\Big(i\Phi(f_t)\psi - i\int_s^t \operatorname{Im}\langle f_t, f_\tau\rangle \, d\tau\psi\Big) = i\Phi(f_t)U(t,s)\psi$$

uniformly in $t \in I$ as $n \to \infty$. It follows that $t \mapsto U(t,s)\psi = \lim_{n\to\infty} U(t,s)\psi_n$ is continuously differentiable even for $\psi \in Y$ with the desired derivative. So, U defined by (3.5) is indeed an evolution system in the wide sense for A on $Y = D(H_\omega^{1/2})$, and it is also unique by virtue of [15] (Theorem 1).

With the help of the above well-posedness result for Segal field operators we will now establish the well-posedness of the initial value problems for operators $H_\omega + \Phi(f_t)$ in $\mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h})$ with $\mathfrak{h} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Such operators are sometimes called van Hove Hamiltonians and they describe a classical particle coupled to a time-dependent quantized field of bosons: H_ω describes the energy of the field while $\Phi(f_t)$ describes the interaction of the particle with the field. (See, for instance, [7] or [20].) The operator H_ω is the second quantization of the dispersion relation $\omega : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$, a measurable function with $\omega(k) > 0$ for almost every $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$, that is, H_ω is the operator on $\mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h}) = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}} \mathfrak{h}_+^{(n)}$ defined by

$$(H_\omega\psi)^{(n)} := H_\omega^{(n)}\psi^{(n)} \quad \text{for } \psi \in D(H_\omega) := \{\psi \in \mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h}) : (H_\omega^{(n)}\psi^{(n)}) \in \mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h})\}, \tag{3.7}$$

where the operators $H_\omega^{(n)}$ act by multiplication as follows:

$$H_\omega^{(0)}\psi^{(0)} := 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (H_\omega^{(n)}\psi^{(n)})(k_1,\dots,k_n) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega(k_i)\psi^{(n)}(k_1,\dots,k_n) \tag{3.8}$$

for $\psi^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{h}_+^{(0)} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\psi^{(n)} \in \mathfrak{h}_+^{(n)} = L^2_+(\mathbb{R}^{3n}) := \{\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3n}) : \varphi(k_{\sigma(1)},\dots,k_{\sigma(n)}) = \varphi(k_1,\dots,k_n)$ for all permutations $\sigma\}$ (Example 1 in Section X.7 of [33]). It is well-known and easy to see that H_ω is a positive self-adjoint operator and that for all f with $f \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $f/\sqrt{\omega} \in \mathfrak{h}$ one has: $D(H_\omega^{1/2}) \subset D(\Phi(f))$ and

$$\|\Phi(f)\psi\| \le 2^{1/2}\big(\,\|f\|^2 + \big\|f/\sqrt{\omega}\big\|^2\,\big)^{1/2}\|(H_\omega+1)^{1/2}\psi\| \tag{3.9}$$

for all $\psi \in D(H_\omega^{1/2})$. (See, for instance, (13.70) of [36] or (20.33) and (20.34) of [13].) With the help of (3.9) it easily follows that $\Phi(f)$ is infinitesimally bounded w.r.t. H_ω and hence that $H_\omega + \Phi(f)$ is self-adjoint on $D(H_\omega)$ provided $f \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $f/\sqrt{\omega} \in \mathfrak{h}$.

Corollary 3.2. *Set $A(t) = -i(H_\omega + \Phi(f_t))$ in $X := \mathcal{F}_+(\mathfrak{h})$, where $\mathfrak{h} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\omega : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ is measurable with $\omega(k) > 0$ for almost all $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and suppose that $t \mapsto f_t/\sqrt{\omega} \in \mathfrak{h}$ is continuous and $t \mapsto f_t \in \mathfrak{h}$ is absolutely continuous. Then there exists a unique evolution system U for A on $D(H_\omega)$ and it is given by* (3.10) *and* (3.12) *below.*

Proof. It follows from the remarks above that the operators $A(t)$ are skew self-adjoint with time-independent domain $D(H_\omega)$ because $f_t, f_t/\sqrt{\omega} \in \mathfrak{h}$ by assumption. Since at least formally $[H_\omega, i\Phi(g)] = \Phi(i\omega g)$ by virtue of Lemma 2.5 (ii) of [6], the p-fold commutators (1.3) will not collapse to a complex scalar in general. We can therefore not hope to apply the results from Section 2.1 and 2.2 directly. We can, however, reduce the desired assertion to Corollary 3.1 by switching to the interaction picture, that is, we define a candidate for the sought evolution system U as the interaction picture evolution,

$$U(t,s) := e^{-iH_\omega t}\tilde{U}(t,s)e^{iH_\omega s}, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\tilde{U}$ denotes the evolution system for $\tilde{A}$ with $\tilde{A}(t) := -ie^{iH_\omega t}\Phi(f_t)e^{-iH_\omega t}$. It has to be shown, of course, that this evolution exists on an appropriate dense subspace, and this can be done by way of Corollary 3.1. Indeed,

$$e^{iH_\omega t}\Phi(f)e^{-iH_\omega t} = \Phi(e^{i\omega t}f) \quad (f \in \mathfrak{h}, t \in \mathbb{R}) \tag{3.11}$$

by Theorem X.41 (e) of [33], that is, the operator $\tilde{A}(t)$ is (i times) a Segal field operator,

$$\tilde{A}(t) = -ie^{iH_\omega t}\Phi(f_t)e^{-iH_\omega t} = i\Phi(\tilde{f}_t) \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{f}_t := -e^{i\omega t}f_t$$

and $t \mapsto \tilde{f}_t$ is obviously continuous. So, by Corollary 3.1, the evolution system $\tilde{U}$ exists on the maximal continuity subspace $\tilde{Y}^\circ$ for $\tilde{A}$ and is given by

$$\tilde{U}(t,s) = W(g_{t,s})e^{-i/2\int_s^t\int_s^\tau \mathrm{Im}\langle \tilde{f}_\tau, \tilde{f}_\sigma\rangle\, d\sigma\, d\tau} \quad \text{with} \quad g_{t,s} := \int_s^t \tilde{f}_\tau\, d\tau. \tag{3.12}$$

We now show that U, given by (3.10) and (3.12), is an evolution system for A on $D(H_\omega)$. In order to see that $t \mapsto U(t,s)\psi$ is differentiable for all $\psi \in D(H_\omega)$ with the desired derivative

$$t \mapsto -i(H_\omega + \Phi(f_t))U(t,s)\psi, \tag{3.13}$$

we have to show in view of (3.10) that

$$D(H_\omega) \subset \tilde{Y}^\circ \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{U}(t,s)D(H_\omega) \subset D(H_\omega) \quad ((s,t) \in \Delta). \tag{3.14}$$

And in order to show that (3.13) is continuous, we would like to move the unbounded operators H_ω and $\Phi(f_t)$ through the constituents $e^{-iH_\omega t}$ and $W(g_{t,s})$ of $U(t,s)$ in a suitable way. We first show the inclusion (3.14.a) and the continuity of $t \mapsto \Phi(f_t)U(t,s)\psi$ for all $\psi \in D(H_\omega)$. It easily follows from (3.9) and the assumed continuity of $t \mapsto f_t, f_t/\sqrt{\omega} \in \mathfrak{h}$ that

$$D(H_\omega) \subset D(H_\omega^{1/2}) \subset \tilde{Y}^\circ \tag{3.15}$$

and hence that (3.14.a) holds true. It also follows from (3.11) and (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(f_t)e^{-iH_\omega t} &= e^{-iH_\omega t}\Phi(e^{i\omega t}f_t),\\ \Phi(e^{i\omega t}f_t)W(g_{t,s}) &= W(g_{t,s})\big(\Phi(e^{i\omega t}f_t) - \operatorname{Im}\langle e^{i\omega t}f_t, g_{t,s}\rangle\big).\end{aligned}$$

So, $t \mapsto \Phi(f_t)e^{-iH_\omega t}W(g_{t,s})\psi$ and hence $t \mapsto \Phi(f_t)U(t,s)\psi$ is continuous for $\psi \in D(H_\omega)$ because $t \mapsto \Phi(e^{i\omega t}f_t)\psi$ is continuous for $\psi \in D(H_\omega)$ by (3.9) and because $t \mapsto W(g_{t,s})$ is strongly continuous by Proposition 5.2.4 (4) of [2]. We now show the inclusion (3.14.b) and the continuity of $t \mapsto H_\omega U(t,s)\psi$ for all $\psi \in D(H_\omega)$ by showing that $W(g_{t,s})D(H_\omega) \subset D(H_\omega)$ and that H_ω can be moved through $W(g_{t,s})$ in a suitable way. It is here that the assumed absolute continuity of $t \mapsto f_t$ will come into play. Since

$$W(g)D(H_\omega) = D(H_\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad H_\omega W(g) = W(g)\big(H_\omega + \Phi(i\omega g) + \langle g, \omega g\rangle/2\big) \tag{3.16}$$

for every $g \in D(\omega) = \{h \in \mathfrak{h} : \omega h \in \mathfrak{h}\}$ (Lemma 2.5 (ii) of [6]), we are led to showing that

$$g_{t,s} \in D(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad t \mapsto \omega g_{t,s} \in \mathfrak{h} \text{ is continuous.} \tag{3.17}$$

In order to do so, notice that the map $\tau \mapsto f_\tau$, being absolutely continuous with values in the reflexive space $\mathfrak{h}$, is differentiable almost everywhere (Corollary 1.2.7 of [1]) and that $\tau \mapsto e^{i\omega\tau}(i\omega+1)^{-1}$ is strongly continuously differentiable. We can therefore (Proposition 1.2.3 of [1]) perform the following integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned}-g_{t,s} &= \int_s^t e^{i\omega\tau}(i\omega+1)^{-1}f_\tau\,d\tau + \int_s^t e^{i\omega\tau}i\omega\,(i\omega+1)^{-1}f_\tau\,d\tau\\ &= (i\omega+1)^{-1}\Big(\int_s^t e^{i\omega\tau}f_\tau\,d\tau + e^{i\omega\tau}f_\tau\Big|_{\tau=s}^{\tau=t} - \int_s^t e^{i\omega\tau}f'_\tau\,d\tau\Big).\end{aligned}$$

So, (3.17) follows. With the help of (3.17) we now obtain from (3.16) the following conclusions: first, that $W(g_{t,s})D(H_\omega) = D(H_\omega)$ for all $(s,t) \in \Delta$ and hence that (3.14.b) holds true and second, that $t \mapsto H_\omega W(g_{t,s})\psi$ and hence $t \mapsto H_\omega U(t,s)\psi$ is continuous for $\psi \in D(H_\omega)$ because $t \mapsto \Phi(i\omega g_{t,s})\psi$ is continuous for $\psi \in D(H_\omega)$ by (3.9) and (3.17) and because $t \mapsto W(g_{t,s})$ is strongly continuous by Proposition 5.2.4 (4) of [2]. ■

If one suitably strengthens or modifies the assumptions of Corollary 3.2, one can conclude the well-posedness statement of that corollary (but not the representation (3.10) and (3.12) for the evolution, of course) by means of various general well-posedness theorems. Indeed, if for instance one adds the assumption that $t \mapsto f_t/\sqrt{\omega} \in \mathfrak{h}$ be absolutely continuous as well, then the well-posedness statement of Corollary 3.2 can also be concluded from [17] (Theorem 1) because, under the thus strengthened assumptions, the strong $W^{1,1}$-regularity condition on $t \mapsto A(t)$ required in [17] can be verified by means of (3.9). Similarly, if one replaces the absolute continuity condition on $t \mapsto f_t$ by the assumption that both $t \mapsto f_t$ and $t \mapsto f_t/\sqrt{\omega}$ be of bounded variation and continuous, then the well-posedness statement of Corollary 3.2 can be concluded from [15] (Theorem 3). It is not difficult to find functions ω and f_t as in the above corollary such that $t \mapsto f_t/\sqrt{\omega}$ is not of bounded variation (so that Corollary 3.2 does not follow from [15]). Choose, for instance, $f_0 \in \mathfrak{h}$ with $f_0(k) = 1$ for $|k| \leq 1$, and $\alpha \in [3/2, 3)$ and then set

$$\omega(k) := |k|^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad f_t(k) := e^{i\omega(k)^{-1/2}t} f_0(k) \quad (k \in \mathbb{R}^3).$$

3.2 Schrödinger operators for external electric fields

In this subsection we apply the well-posedness result of Section 2.2 to Schrödinger operators $-\Delta + b(t) \cdot x$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Such operators describe a quantum particle in a time-dependent spatially constant electric field $b(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and they are shown to be essentially self-adjoint below. Setting $A(t) = \overline{i\Delta - ib(t) \cdot x}$, we obtain by formal computation

$$[A(t_1), A(t_2)] = 2\sum_{\kappa=1}^{d} (b_\kappa(t_2) - b_\kappa(t_1))\partial_\kappa, \quad \big[[A(t_1), A(t_2)], A(t_3)\big] = \mu(t_1, t_2, t_3) \quad (3.18)$$

with $\mu(t_1, t_2, t_3) := -2i\sum_{\kappa=1}^{d} (b_\kappa(t_2) - b_\kappa(t_1))b_\kappa(t_3) \in \mathbb{C}$. In view of (3.18) we expect to obtain well-posedness for the operators $A(t)$ by means of Theorem 2.3 with $p = 2$. Indeed, we have (see also the remarks below):

Corollary 3.3. *Set $A(t) = \overline{A_0 + B(t)}$ in $X := L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (existence of the closure is shown below), where $A_0 := i\Delta$ with $D(A_0) = W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and where $B(t)$ is multiplication by $-ib(t) \cdot x$, and suppose $t \mapsto b(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous. Then there exists a unique evolution system U for A on the maximal continuity subspace Y° for $A = C^{(0)}$ and $C^{(1)}$ defined in* (3.22)*. Additionally, U is given by* (3.23) *and* (3.24) *below.*

Proof. (i) We first show that $A_0 + B(t_0)$ for every $t_0 \in I$ is essentially skew self-adjoint and that the unitary group generated by $A := \overline{A_0 + B(t_0)}$ is given by

$$e^{At} = e^{A_0 t} e^{Bt} e^{-\partial_1 b_1 t^2} \cdots e^{-\partial_d b_d t^2} e^{2ib^2 t^3/3} \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}), \quad (3.19)$$

where $B := B(t_0)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_d) := b(t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We do so by showing that the right hand side of (3.19), which we abbreviate as $T(t)$, defines a strongly continuous unitary group in X with

$$A_0 + B \subset A_T \quad \text{and} \quad T(t)D(A_0 + B) \subset D(A_0 + B) \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}),$$

where A_T stands for the generator of T. (In order to understand why $e^{A\,\cdot}$ should decompose as in (3.19), plug the following formal commutators

$$[B, A_0] = -2\sum_{\kappa=1}^{d} b_\kappa \partial_\kappa, \quad [[B, A_0], B] = 2ib^2, \quad [[B, A_0], A_0] = 0$$

into the Zassenhaus formula [22], [37], [3] for bounded operators.) With the help of the explicit formulas for the groups $e^{A_0\,\cdot}$ (free Schrödinger group), $e^{B\,\cdot}$ (multiplication group), $e^{\partial_\kappa\,\cdot}$ (translation group) we find the following commutation relations,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{A_0 t}e^{\partial_\kappa s} = e^{\partial_\kappa s}e^{A_0 t}, \quad e^{Bt}e^{\partial_\kappa s} = e^{\partial_\kappa s}e^{Bt}e^{ib_\kappa ts}, \\ e^{A_0 t}e^{Bs} = e^{Bs}e^{A_0 t}e^{2\partial_1 b_1 ts}\cdots e^{2\partial_d b_d ts}e^{-ib^2 ts^2} \qquad (s,t \in \mathbb{R}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

It follows from (3.20) that T is indeed a strongly continuous unitary group and that

$$\begin{gathered} e^{\partial_\kappa s}D(A_0) \subset D(A_0), \quad e^{\partial_\kappa s}D(B) \subset D(B), \quad e^{Bs}D(A_0) \subset D(A_0), \\ e^{A_0 t}D(A_0 + B) \subset D(B) \qquad (s,t \in \mathbb{R}), \end{gathered}$$

so that $T(t)D(A_0 + B) \subset D(A_0 + B)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A_0 + B \subset A_T$. Consequently, $A_0 + B$ is essentially skew self-adjoint and $A = \overline{A_0 + B}$ is equal to A_T. After these preparations we can now verify the assumptions of Theorem 2.3 for $p = 2$. Indeed, using the commutation relations (3.20) we find that

$$e^{C_{12}\sigma}e^{A_3\tau} = e^{A_3\tau}e^{C_{12}\sigma}e^{\mu_{123}\tau\sigma}, \quad e^{A_1\sigma}e^{A_2\tau} = e^{A_2\tau}e^{A_1\sigma}e^{C_{12}\tau\sigma}e^{\mu_{122}\tau^2\sigma/2}e^{\mu_{121}\tau\sigma^2/2} \tag{3.21}$$

for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, where $A_j := A(t_j) = C^{(0)}(t_j)$, $b_j := b(t_j)$, $\mu_{jkl} := -2i\sum_{\kappa=1}^{d}(b_{k\,\kappa} - b_{j\,\kappa})b_{l\,\kappa}$, and

$$C_{jk} = C^{(1)}(t_j, t_k) \text{ is the closure of } 2\sum_{\kappa=1}^{d}(b_{k\,\kappa} - b_{j\,\kappa})\partial_\kappa, \tag{3.22}$$

that is, C_{jk} generates the translation group $t \mapsto e^{2(b_{k\,1}-b_{j\,1})\partial_1 t}\cdots e^{2(b_{k\,d}-b_{j\,d})\partial_d t}$. And from (3.21), in turn, the commutation relations imposed in Theorem 2.3 follow by differentiation at $\sigma = 0$. Since, moreover, the maximal continuity subspace for $A = C^{(0)}$ and $C^{(1)}$ contains the dense subspace of Schwartz functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$, the existence of a unique evolution system U for A on Y° follows by Theorem 2.3.

(ii) We now show the following representation formula for U:

$$U(t,s) = W(t)\tilde{U}(t,s)W(s)^{-1} = e^{\overline{(\int_0^t B(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ}}\, e^{\overline{\int_s^t \tilde{A}(\tau)\,d\tau}}\, e^{-\overline{(\int_0^s B(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ}}, \tag{3.23}$$

where $\tilde{U}$ is the evolution system for $\tilde{A}$ on $D := W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\tilde{A}(t) := -i(-i\nabla - c(t))^2$ and $c(t) := \int_0^t b(\tau)\,d\tau$ and where the gauge transformation W is the evolution system for B on Z°, the maximal continuity subspace for B. Clearly, since $B(\tau) = -ib(\tau)\cdot x$ and $\tilde{A}(\tau) = -i\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\xi - c(\tau))^2\mathcal{F}$,

$$e^{\overline{(\int_0^t B(\tau)\,d\tau)^\circ}} = e^{-i\int_0^t b(\tau)\cdot x\,d\tau} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\overline{\int_s^t \tilde{A}(\tau)\,d\tau}} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}e^{-i\int_s^t(\xi - c(\tau))^2\,d\tau}\mathcal{F} \tag{3.24}$$

(which last expression could be cast into a more explicit integral form similar to the explicit integral representation of the free Schrödinger group). It should be noticed that, due to the pairwise commutativity of the opertors $\tilde{A}(t)$ and of the operators $B(t)$, the existence of the evolution systems $\tilde{U}$ and W, and the second equality in (3.23) already follow by [12] and [29]. In order to see the first equality in (3.23), one shows by similar arguments as those of part (i) above that the subspace $Y_0^\circ := D \cap Z^\circ$ of Y° is invariant under $W(s)^{-1}$, $\tilde{U}(t,s)$, $W(t)$ and that

$$A_0 W(t)f = W(t)\tilde{A}(t)f$$

$$B(r)\tilde{U}(t,s)f = \tilde{U}(t,s)\Big(B(r)f - 2\sum_{\kappa=1}^d b_\kappa(r)\,(t-s)\,\partial_\kappa f + 2i\sum_{\kappa=1}^d b_\kappa(r)\int_s^t c_\kappa(\tau)\,d\tau\,f\Big)$$

for $f \in Y_0^\circ$. (Show commutation relations for $e^{\tilde{A}(r_1)\sigma}$ and $e^{B(r_2)\tau}$ analogous to (3.20) to obtain commutation relations for $B(r_2)$ with $e^{\tilde{A}(r_1)\sigma}$ and then use the standard product approximants for the evolution systems W and $\tilde{U}$.) It then follows that U_0 defined by $U_0(t,s) := W(t)\tilde{U}(t,s)W(s)^{-1}$ is an evolution system for A on Y_0°, which by the standard uniqueness argument for evolution systems must coincide with U. ■

We see from part (ii) of the above proof that the existence of an evolution system U_0 for A on the subspace Y_0°, after a suitable gauge transformation, already follows by [12], [29] – but in order to obtain well-posedness on Y°, the results from [12], [29] do not suffice, because the subspace Y_0° is strictly contained in Y° in general. (Indeed, if for instance $b(t) \equiv 1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d = 1$, then the function ψ with $\psi(\xi) := e^{i\xi^3/3}/\xi$ for $\xi \in [1,\infty)$ and $\psi(\xi) := 0$ for $\xi \in (-\infty, 1)$ does not belong to the range of $C - i := i\partial_\xi + \xi^2 - i$. Consequently, $-\partial_x^2 + x - i = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(C-i)\mathcal{F}$ is not surjective so that

$$Y_0^\circ = D(A_0 + B) = D(-\partial_x^2 + x) \subsetneq D(\overline{-\partial_x^2 + x}) = D(A) = Y^\circ$$

by the standard criterion for self-adjointness.) We finally remark that the results of [43] do not apply to the situation of this section.

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank Prof. Marcel Griesemer for many helpful discussions and comments. Also I would like to thank DFG for financial support under the grant GR 3213/1-1.

References

[1] W. Arendt, C. Batty, M. Hieber, F. Neubrander: *Vector-valued Laplace transforms and Cauchy problems.* 2nd edition, Birkhäuser, 2012.

[2] O. Bratteli, D. W. Robinson: *Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics 1 and 2.* 2nd edition, Springer, 1987, 1997.

[3] F. Casas, A. Murua, M. Nadinic: *Efficient computation of the Zassenhaus formula.* arXiv:1204.0389 (2012).

[4] D. Cohn: *Measure theory.* 2nd edition, Birkhäuser, 2013.

[5] A. Constantin: *The construction of an evolution system in the hyperbolic case and applications.* Math. Nachr. **224** (2001), 49-73.

[6] J. Dereziński, C. Gérard: *Asymptotic completeness in quantum field theory. Massive Pauli–Fierz Hamiltonians.* Rev. Math. Phys. **11** (1999), 383-450.

[7] J. Dereziński: *Van Hove Hamiltonians – exactly solvable models of the infrared and ultraviolet problem.* Ann. H. Poincaré (2003), 713-738.

[8] J. Dimock: *Quantum mechanics and quantum field theory. A mathematical primer.* Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[9] J. R. Dorroh: *A simplified proof of a theorem of Kato on linear evolution equations* J. Math. Soc. Japan **27** (1975), 474-478.

[10] K.-J. Engel, R. Nagel: *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations.* Springer, 2000.

[11] F. Fer: *Résolution de l'équation matricielle $dU/dt = pU$ par produit infini d'exponentielles matricielles.* Bull. Cl. Sci. **44** (1958), 818-829.

[12] J. A. Goldstein: *Abstract evolution equations.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (1969), 159-184.

[13] S. J. Gustafson, I. M. Sigal: *Mathematical concepts of quantum mechanics.* 2nd edition, Springer, 2011.

[14] S. Ishii: *Linear evolution equations $du/dt + A(t)u = 0$: a case where $A(t)$ is strongly uniform-measurable.* J. Math. Soc. Japan **34** (1982), 413-424.

[15] T. Kato: *Integration of the equation of evolution in a Banach space.* J. Math. Soc. Japan **5** (1953), 208-234.

[16] T. Kato: *Linear evolution equations of "hyperbolic" type.* J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **17** (1970), 241-258.

[17] T. Kato: *Linear evolution equations of "hyperbolic" type II.* J. Math. Soc. Japan **25** (1973), 648-666.

[18] T. Kato: *Abstract differential equations and nonlinear mixed problems.* Lezioni Fermiane, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa (1985), 1-89.

[19] T. Kato: *Abstract evolution equations, linear and quasilinear, revisited.* In Lecture Notes in Math. **1540** (1993), 241-258.

[20] J. v. Keler, S. Teufel: *Non-adiabatic transitions in a massless scalar field.* arXiv:1204.0344 (2012).

[21] K. Kobayasi: *On a theorem for linear evolution equations of hyperbolic type.* J. Math. Soc. Japan **31** (1979), 647-654.

[22] W. Magnus: *On the exponential solution of differential equations for a linear operator.* Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **7** (1954), 649-673.

[23] M. Merkli: *The ideal quantum gas.* In Lecture Notes in Math. **1880** (2006), 183-233.

[24] R. Nagel, G. Nickel: *Well-posedness for nonautonomous abstract Cauchy problems.* Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **50** (2002), 279-293.

[25] R. Nagel, G. Nickel, R. Schnaubelt: private communication, 2014.

[26] H. Neidhardt, V. A. Zagrebnov: *Linear non-autonomous Cauchy problems and evolution semigroups.* Adv. Diff. Eq. **14** (2009), 289-340.

[27] H. Neidhardt, V. A. Zagrebnov: private communication, 2014.

[28] G. Nickel: *On evolution semigroups and wellposedness of nonautonomous Cauchy problems.* PhD thesis, 1996.

[29] G. Nickel, R. Schnaubelt: *An extension of Kato's stability condition for nonautonomous Cauchy problems.* Taiw. J. Math. **2** (1998), 483-496.

[30] G. Nickel: *Evolution semigroups and product formulas for nonautonomous Cauchy problems.* Math Nachr. **212** (2000), 101-115.

[31] A. Pazy: *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations.* Springer, 1983.

[32] R. S. Phillips: *Perturbation theory for semi-groups of linear operators.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **74** (1953), 199-221.

[33] M. Reed, B. Simon: *Methods of modern mathematical physics I-IV.* Academic Press, 1980, 1975, 1979, 1978.

[34] J. Schmid, M. Griesemer: *Well-posedness of non-autonomous linear evolution equations in uniformly convex spaces.* arXiv:1501.06092 (2015).

[35] R. Schnaubelt: *Well-posedness and asymptotic behaviour of non-autonomous linear evolution equations.* Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **50** (2002), 311-338.

[36] H. Spohn: *Dynamics of charged particles and their radiation field.* Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[37] M. Suzuki: *On the convergence of exponential operators – the Zassenhaus formula, BCH formula and systematic approximants.* Commun. Math. Phys. **57** (1977), 193-200.

[38] N. Tanaka: *Generation of linear evolution operators.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **128** (2000), 2007-2015.

[39] N. Tanaka: *A characterization of evolution operators.* Studia Math. **146**(3) (2001), 285-299.

[40] R. M. Wilcox: *Exponential operators and parameter differentiation in quantum physics.* J. Math. Phys. **3** (1967), 962-982.

[41] A. Yagi: *On a class of linear evolution equations of "hyperbolic" type in reflexive Banach spaces.* Osaka J. Math. **16** (1979), 301-315.

[42] A. Yagi: *Remarks on proof of a theorem of Kato and Kobayasi on linear evolution equations.* Osaka J. Math. **17** (1980), 233-244.

[43] K. Yajima: *Existence of solutions for Schrödinger evolution equations.* Commun. Math. Phys. **110** (1987), 415-426.